REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action dated May 7, 2009, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 1-4, 6, 9-12 and 14 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. First, the Examiner alleges that claim 1 is unclear because the claim uses the phrase "command/response." Claim 1 has been amended to replace the phrase "command/response" with the phrase "command and response."

Second, the Examiner alleges that, in claims 1, 6, 9 and 14, it is not clear whether the same information is being transmitted twice or if there are two different types of information. Third, the Examiner alleges that in claim 1 it is not clear which device is transmitting or receiving. The Examiner indicates that a similar problem exists in claims 6, 9 and 14. Finally, the Examiner alleges that the word "inability" in claim 1 renders the claim indefinite, and also indicates that a similar problem exists in claims 2-4, 6, 9-12 and 14.

The Applicants have amended the above claims to help clarify the scope of the claims. As amended, the claims now clearly indicate that a command and response line is used to receive a block size setting command which informs the electronic apparatus of the transmitting of information specifying a block size and that the actual block size data is received via a data line.

Specifically, the block size setting command and the information specifying the block size are not the same. The block size setting command is a command for informing the electronic apparatus of transmitting information specifying the block size, and the block size setting command does not include the information specifying the block size. That is, the actual block size data is transmitted only once. The block size setting command is transmitted through the command and response line, and the information specifying the block size is transmitted through the data line.

Additionally, it is clearly shown that the electronic apparatus (an interface section of the electronic apparatus) receives a block size setting command, transmits a response acknowledging receipt of the block size setting command, and receives information specifying the block size. Also, it is clearly shown that the host device (an interface section of the host device) transmits

the block size setting command, receives the response acknowledging receipt of the block size setting command, and transmits information specifying the block size.

Finally, the word "inability" has been removed from the claims.

Based on the above, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is now respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saeki (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0006279, hereafter "Saeki") in view of Bahng (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0001406, hereafter "Bahng"), and further in view of Asami (U.S. Patent No. 6,036,100, hereafter "Asami").

The Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14 to help further distinguish the present invention from the cited prior art. As amended, independent claim 1 recites the following features:

"[a]n electronic apparatus comprising:

an interface section that communicates with a host device through a command and response line and a data line, wherein:

a command and a response are transmitted through the command and response line, and data is transmitted through the data line;

the command, the response and the data are transmitted in this order between the electronic apparatus and the host device;

the transmitted data is divided into data blocks with a block size specified by the host device when a length of the data is at least a predetermined length; and

the interface section receives, via the command and response line, a block size setting command which informs the electronic apparatus of transmitting information specifying the block size and in which the information specifying the block size is not included, transmits a response acknowledging receipt of the block size setting command via the command and response line after receiving the block size setting command, and then receives the information specifying the block size via the data line after transmitting the response acknowledging receipt of the block size setting command;

a storage section that stores the received information specifying the block size; and

a data buffer that stores data, wherein

10

when the specified block size is larger than a capacity of the data buffer, the interface section includes error information indicating that the specified block size is larger than the capacity of the data buffer in a response acknowledging receipt of a command different from the block size setting command, and transmits the response including the error information to the host device." (Emphasis added).

The features noted above in independent claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claims 6, 9 and 14 (as amended). As amended, the difference between the timing of transmitting the block size setting command and the timing of transmitting the information specifying the block size has been clarified in independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14. Specifically, it is clarified that the "transmitting a response" is performed after receiving the block size setting command and "receiving the information specifying the block size" is performed after transmitting the response. Further, it is clarified that the block size setting command does not include the information specifying the block size.

The present invention (as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14) is distinguishable over the cited prior art in that the electronic apparatus receives the information specifying the block size at a different timing from the block size setting command; specifically, after receiving the block size setting command, and more specifically, after transmitting a response to the block size setting command.

The present invention (as recited in independent claims) has a feature that the error information indicating that the specified block size is larger than the capacity of the data buffer is included in a response to a command different from the block size setting command and is transmitted to the host device in order to solve a problem due to receiving the information specifying the block size at a different timing from the block size setting command.

In the Office Action, the Examine relies on Saeki in view of Bahng, and further in view of Asami for disclosing or suggesting all the features of independent claim 1, 6, 9 and 14. However, the Examiner relies primarily on Bahng for disclosing or suggesting the features emphasized above in independent claim 1 (and similarly recited in independent claims 6, 9 and 14).

In Bahng, the host sends the write command to the disk device along with information on the calculated data size (see ¶[0034]). In other words, in Bahng, the information specifying data size is transmitted from the host to the disk device at the same timing as the write command.

11

Thus, the information specifying data size is not transmitted from the host to the disk device after receiving the response to the write command. Thus, the above features of the present invention (as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14) are not disclosed by Bahng.

That is, Bahng fails to disclose or suggest that error information indicating that the specified block size is larger than the capacity of the data buffer is included in a response to a command different from the block size setting command and is transmitted to the host device in order to solve a problem due to receiving the information specifying the block size at a different timing from the block size setting command, as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14 (as amended).

As noted above, Saeki and Asami were not relied on for disclosing or suggesting the above features of the present invention (as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14). Regardless, after a detailed review of the Saeki and Asami, the references fail to overcome the deficiencies in Bahng. Accordingly, no combination of Saeki, Bahng and Asami would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14. Likewise, no combination of Saeki, Bahng and Asami would result in, or otherwise render obvious, claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10-13, 15 and 16 at least by virtue of their dependencies respectfully from independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Seiji NAKAMURA et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/
By: 2009.08.07 14:32:59 -04'00'

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
August 7, 2009